TAXON

OFFICIAL NEWS BULLETIN OF THE

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR PLANT TAXONOMY

VOLUME 1

1951—1952

UTRECHT—NETHERLANDS

Edited and published for the I.A.P.T. by the
International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/taxon_1951-09_1_1

I.A.P.T.

SEPTEMBER 1951
VOL. I No. 1

TAXON

IN CO-OPERATION WITH UNESCO AND IUBS

Official News Bulletin of the International Association for Plant Taxonomy. Edited and Published for I.A.P.T. by the International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, 106 Lange Nieuwstraat, Utrecht, Netherlands

L'avenir de TAXON est entre les mains de ses lecteurs

Lorsqu'on fonde un nouveau journal — financier, politique ou littéraire — on a généralement derrière soi un homme ou un groupe d'hommes résolus à supporter la dépense pendant un temps ou même pendant longtemps. Le rédacteur en chef peut à loisir chercher des collaborateurs, former une équipe et, dès le premier jour, il donnera au nouveau journal le visage exact que souhaitent ses fondateurs.

Avec *Taxon*, il en va autrement. Le rédacteur en chef n'a derrière lui d'autre groupe que les membres de l'Association internationale pour la Taxonomie végétale. Il n'a d'autre équipe que celle formée par les collaborateurs volontaires et occasionnels, équipe qui s'assemblera et se désagrègera pour chaque numéro de *Taxon:* à propement parler, une équipe-fantôme.

Ce sont des circonstances difficiles pour lancer et pour faire vivre un journal; il faut donc que tous les membres de l'A.I.T.V. en prennent une parfaite conscience. Car ce sont eux qui seront en vérité les rédacteurs responsables, ce sont eux qui, par les articles qu'ils enverront, feront vivre ou laisseront dépérir leur journal, *Taxon.*

Ainsi, non seulement nous demandons aux membres un grand effort scientifique et matériel, mais encore nous demandons que cet effort soit continu. Nous devons compter sur eux car, dans cette affaire, M. Lanjouw ne peut être qu'un simple jardinier. Il sème, il arrose, il taille, il greffe; mais il doit se sentir soutenu par son patron qui fournit l'argent pour les outils, les graines, les produits (c'est à dire, d'une façon générale, lui assure l'existence matérielle) et qui, en outre, aussi souvent que possible, lui donne des conseils, exprime ses voeux et lui prodigue ses encouragements. Or, le patron, c'est vous, et je n'ai employé cette comparaison que pour mieux faire pénétrer dans votre esprit le sentiment de responsabilité envers *Taxon* qui doit vous animer.

Vivat!....

Taxon, qui devient votre journal, est destiné en premier lieu à former un lien entre les membres dispersés de l'A.I.T.V.; régulièrement, ceux-ci auront des nouvelles les uns des autres et des renseignements sur la marche des travaux de l'Association. Faisant office de tribune, *Taxon* devra être utilisé par chacun pour y discuter librement de tous les sujets qui intéressent les taxonomistes. C'est là que doivent s'affronter, avant les Congrès internationaux, les thèses et se préparer les décisions. Il n'est donc pas question d'en faire un nouveau journal de systématique où l'on accueillerait des listes d'espèces et des revisions de genres: ces travaux doivent être laissés aux revues existantes ou au *Forum phytotaxonomicum.*

De plus, chacun doit s'ingénier à faire connaître l'Association autour de lui, à attirer en son sein tous ceux (et ils sont légion) qui s'occupent de taxonomie végétale, qui vivent de et pour cette science. Lorsque notre cercle, déjà étendu, comprendra quatre ou cinq fois plus d'adhérents, alors nous pourrons faire de grandes choses.

.... crescat!....

Encourager ceux qui ont entrepris de créer ce nouvel organe; envoyer au rédacteur des articles assez nombreux pour qu'il puisse choisir ce qui lui convient pour former un numéro; trouver de nouveaux membres. Tels sont les trois guides que chacun devrait adopter pour mener *Taxon* au succès.

.... et floreat!

CHARLES BAEHNI.

Editor's Introduction

The enthousiastic words of our President will have awakened in the members of the I.A.P.T. the urgent desire to assist the editors of *"Taxon"* in their endeavour to make this journal an effective medium of international phytotaxonomical communication. In this mood it will interest them to hear what are for the moment the plans of the editors. To comply with this we have listed below the kind of news-items and of articles we consider especially interesting. This list, however, is by no means exclusive, for, as Dr Baehni has rightly remarked, the success of this journal depends on the members of the I.A.P.T. themselves and its ultimate shape and contents will be decided by their collaboration. For this reason they should send us all information of which they think that it will interest at least a part of the other members. The first number of *"Taxon"* remains no doubt below the standard we hope to reach in the near future. The few items of personal news the members will find in this issue are meant as examples only. The members are asked to coöperate by informing us of what is going on in the world of plant taxonomy. In doing this they should not wait till the next issue is about to appear, but they should send their contributions at once. By our joined endeavours *„Taxon"* should become an example to all journals issued by international coöperation.

What kind of news-items we need for Taxon

1. News on regional flora's in preparation.
2. Important additions to Herbaria.
3. Important changes in the staff of Taxonomical Institutes.
4. All further important news with regard to Taxonomical Institutes.
5. Important collecting trips.
6. News on monographies or revisions in preparation.
7. Important new publications.
8. Important news about regional or local Societies, Committees etc.
9. Important international news relating to Taxonomy.
10. Important questions relating to Taxonomy and Nomenclature on which you want to know the opinion of collegues in other countries.
11. Pleas for coöperation in Taxonomical work.

What kind of short Articles we need for Taxon

1. Biographies of important taxonomists.
2. Publication dates of important taxonomic works.
3. Studies on the itinerary of early botanical collectors.
4. Important questions relating to Nomenclature.
5. Remarks on Taxonomical methodology.
6. Principles of general taxonomy.
7. New classifications.

IN MEMORIAM

Prof. Dr Johannes Mattfeld

Leider hat der Vorstand des „International Association for Plant Taxonomy" kurz nach der Gründung eines ihrer Mitglieder verloren. Am 19. Januar 1951 ist Herr Prof. Dr Joh. Mattfeld im Alter von 56 Jahren verstorben.

Prof. Mattfeld wird bei vielen Botanikern persönlich, aber noch mehr durch seine Schriften bekannt sein. Bei seinem Verscheiden war er stellvertretend Direktor des Botanischen Museums zu Berlin-Dahlem.

Auf internationalem Gebiete zeichnete er sich aus durch seine Mitwirkung an die Botanische Congresse zu Amsterdam, 1935, und Stockholm, 1950, als Sekretär für die Diskussionen in Deutscher Sprache. Hier zeigte er grosze und eingehende Kenntnisse.

Wir hoffen in einer nächsten Nummer in der Gelegenheit zu sein ein ausführlicheres Wort seinem Gedächtnis gewidmet aufnehmen zu können. Wir sind dankbar für dasjenige, das er für die internationale Zusammenarbeit auf unserem Gebiete getan hat.

The End of a Generation of Harvard Botanists

Reed C. Rollins

The death of M. L. Fernald on September 22, 1950, brought to a close the activities of four taxonomic botanists with academic degrees from Harvard University, who were long associated with its various botanical institutes. In the short space of time from the passing of C. A. Weatherby on June 21, 1949, it has been necessary to record the deaths of Alfred Rehder (July 21, 1949) and Oakes Ames (April 28, 1950). These four men made botanical history at Harvard, each playing a special role within the precincts of the University in developing and maintaining a high order of research in taxonomic botany and related fields. Biographical sketches of them (Fernald, 1949; Kobuski, 1950; Sax, 1950; Rollins, Pease and Raup, 1950) have emphasized their respective careers in greater detail than is my present purpose. Here I desire to dwell upon only a few salient facts and highlights concerning each of these well known men. Although all were retired or in a quasi-retired status, they continued actively to contribute to the science of botany and to aid in various ways the institutes with which they were connected. The loss to the University and to botany with their passing is one of major proportions, the accurate evaluation of which may not be made for some time.

Charles Alfred Weatherby (1875—1949) was early a student of the classics and modern languages, having received A.B. and A.M. degrees from Harvard in these subjects. His entrance into the science of botany came after he had studied plants as a hobby for many years. At first, he worked only intermittently with a committee of the Connecticut Botanical Society on the flora of that State. The results of his committee work appeared in 1910 as a *Catalogue of the Flowering Plants and Ferns of Connecticut.* Weatherby was a part-time, and largely voluntary, Assistant at the Gray Herbarium from 1908 to 1929, a period when his home remained at Hartford, Connecticut. In the latter year, he moved to Cambridge and entered into a full-time position at the Gray Herbarium, becoming successively Assistant, Assistant Curator, and Senior Curator. At his retirement in 1940 he was appointed Research Associate.

Weatherby's earliest papers dealt with various Angiosperms of the New England flora, Mexico, and other areas of North and South America. However, he found his most enduring interest in the *Pteridophyta,* where his greatest contributions were made. His taxonomic papers were prepared with meticulous care after painstaking research had established the facts upon which they were based. They were models of English prose in the botanical field. Weatherby was often consulted by American botanists on questions of nomenclature and the interpretation of the International Rules. As a member of the Committee on Nomenclature appointed at the International Botanical Congress in Amsterdam in 1935, he worked assiduously at the task of checking hundreds of generic names proposed for conservation. He was most accommodating to fellow botanists on all occasions, most assuredly deserving of the title „botanist and helper of botanists" used in a biographical sketch of him by Fernald (l.c.).

Alfred Rehder (1863—1949) received his botanical training in Germany at the Gymnasium at Zwickau, Sachsen, and at the Botanic Garden of the University of Berlin, where he studied under Eichler and Ascherson. He came to the United States in 1898 and soon became associated with the Arnold Arboretum, where he remained the rest of his life. He was awarded a Master of Arts degree from Harvard in 1913. In 1918 he became curator of the herbarium and in 1934 he was appointed to the faculty of Harvard University as Associate Professor of Dendrology. His retirement came in 1940, at the age of 76.

Rehder combined an interest in botany with botanical bibliography and nomenclature. His monumental "Bradley Bibliography" and more recent "Bibliography of Cultivated Trees and Shrubs Hardy in the Cooler Temperate Regions of the Northern Hemisphere" are products of sustained effort that was truly remarkable. Besides these, Rehder produced a "Manual of Cultivated Trees and Shrubs Hardy in North America, Exclusive of the Subtropical and Warmer Temperate Regions" in 1927, with a revised second edition in 1940. His concentration on trees and shrubs in these books and his numerous monographic studies reflect the area of specialization of the Arnold Arboretum, as do his many studies on Chinese plants. The latter began as a result of the exploratory activities of the late E. H. Wilson, whose massive collections of Chinese plants are known throughout the world.

Professor Rehder was a most industrious writer and editor, having served in the latter capacity on the Journal of the Arnold Arboretum for many years. In spite of his preoccupation with the technical aspects of taxonomy, he was much interested in the problems of the horticulturist. He provided many horticulturists with individual attention, in addition to the professional guidance they obtained from his published works.

Oakes Ames (1874—1950) served Harvard University in various teaching, research and administrative capacities, for nearly half a century. He received the A.B. and A.M. degrees from Harvard and was immediately appointed Instructor in Botany by his own University in 1900. At various times in the following years he was associated with Harvard's Arnold Arboretum, the now defunct Botanic Garden, the Atkins Garden in Cuba, and the Biological Laboratories, but his most consistent association was with the Botanical Museum. In the latter, he was successively Curator, Supervisor, and Director until 1945, when, at his own request, he became Associate Director, a post he held until the time of his death. In the academic faculty of the University, Ames was Professor of Botany, later Arnold Professor of Botany, and finally Research Professor of Botany, from which he became Emeritus in 1941.

In conjunction with his activities at the Botanical Museum and his interest in the Orchidaceae, Ames amassed an herbarium of about 65,000 specimens of Orchids. This collection, now known as the Ames Orchid Herbarium, contains thousands of floral dissections preserved on glass slides, as well as much material in liquid preservative. The working library he built up along with his herbarium is unusually complete. Ames published widely on the Orchidaceae, often with excellent illustrations and usually with no expense spared in the preparation, printing, and manufacture of the books and pamphlets produced under his own editorship. A secondary but important interest of Ames was in economic botany. He greatly augmented the materials for teaching and research in this field at the Botanical Museum and, with various associates, brought together a library of over 16,000 volumes on the subject. Ames was a wealthy man and he used this wealth generously in the interests of the science of botany.

Merritt Lyndon Fernald (1873—1950) came to the Gray Herbarium as a student in 1891 and, after receiving a Bachelor of Science degree from Harvard in 1897, became a member of the faculty of the University. In 1915 he was appointed Fisher Professor of Natural History (the chair once held by Asa Gray), becoming Fisher Professor Emeritus in 1947. He followed B. L. Robinson as Curator of the Gray Herbarium, taking up his duties in 1935. This post was converted to that of Director in 1937 and Fernald served in that capacity until his retirement in 1947. From the beginning, Fernald's research was carried on at the Gray Herbarium, which fostered his botanical exploration of the Gaspé Peninsula, Newfoundland, and numerous other areas in eastern North America.

Fernald's life was largely devoted to an intensive study of the higher plants of temperate eastern North America. Through his intimate knowledge of the flora of this area, he established himself as the leading authority on questions relating to it. As a young man he had collaborated with B. L. Robinson in producing the Seventh Edition of Gray's Manual of Botany of the Flora of Northeastern North America, published in 1908. Forty-two years later and only a few months before his death, Professor Fernald had the satisfaction of handling the first copies of the Eighth Edition (enlarged and completely rewritten) of this century-old classic. He had worked diligently at this revision for over fifteen years.

By far the largest amount of Fernald's published work (amounting to over 750 titles) concerned questions of identities, accurate definition, and geographical distribution of a wide range of vascular plants. His papers were always highly critical, carefully prepared, well written and full of the results of very keen observation, setting an unusually high standard within their fields. His evidence that higher plants persisted through the glacial periods in certain favored locations in boreal America stimulated glacial geologists to re-examine their concepts of the extent and movement of the great ice sheets of those periods. As Editor-in-Chief of Rhodora from 1928 until the time of his death, he handled numerous botanical publications sent in for review. These stimulated him to write vigorous critiques and reviews, some of which have become classics of their kind.

Literature Cited

Fernald, M. L. 1949. Charles Alfred Weatherby, Botanist and Helper of Botanists. (with portrait). Rhodora 51: 169—191.

See further at the foot of p. 5

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR PLANT TAXONOMY

On Tuesday, the 18th of July 1950, Taxonomists attending the Seventh International Botanical Congress at Stockholm met to discuss ways and means of co-operating more effectively at the international level. This meeting resulted in the foundation of the "International Association for plant Taxonomy" (I.A.P.T.). 130 Taxonomists from all parts of the world at once showed their support of this action by joining the new Association. More than 300 members have been registered already.

Managing Board.

Dr Ch. Baehni, President.
Dr R. C. Rollins, Vice-President.
Dr J. Lanjouw, Secretary-Treasurer.
Dr W. Robyns, Administrator of Finances.
Dr F. R. Fosberg, Dr R. E. Fries, Miss C. M. Eardley, Dr H. Humbert, Dr J. Mattfeld †, Dr J. A. Nannfeldt, Dr C. G. G. J. van Steenis, Dr W. B. Turrill, Members.

Office.

International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, Lange Nieuwstraat 106, Utrecht, Netherlands.

Membership.

A. Individual Persons.
Regular Members. This group will receive "Taxon" free of costs and one copy each of all other publications at reduced prices. They have a right to vote on all questions that are raised in the Association and are eligable for all functions. Fee 3 $ per year.
Associate Members. "Taxon" free, but no reduction for other publications, no voting right and not eligable for functions. Fee 1 $ per year.

B. Institutes, Societies etc.
Regular Members. Same rights as the ordinary individual members. Fee 25 $ per year.
Institutes, Societies, Horticultural firms etc. with a sufficiently high annual budget are expected to pay a fee of 50 $ or more. This group will be known as „supporting members".
Associate Members. Same rights as the associate individual members. Fee 10 $ per year.

Aims.

To consider measures for the future development of Plant Taxonomy and Plant Geography, and to organize the execution of such plans as require international co-operation.

To the latter belong:
The holding of International Congresses and Symposia in the field of Plant Taxonomy and Geography.
Editing and publication of the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature and the handling of proposals for their amendment.
Standardization of phytographical terminology.
Publication of monographs of plant groups.
Promotion of exchange of materials and literature.
Maintenance and publication of the Index Herbariorum.
Co-ordination of the compilation and publishing of indices to plant names and illustrations.
Photographing and distribution of prints of types and other historical specimens.
Phytogeographical cartography.
Stimulation of opportunities for exchanges of members of faculties and staffs of institutions in different countries and botanical travel in general.

Publications.

"Taxon". The official News Bulletin of the International Association for Plant Taxonomy. In the beginning this will be issued at irregular intervals, but we hope that we will soon be able to publish it monthly or bimonthly. It will contain all kind of news that may be of interest to Taxonomy and Phytogeography.

"Forum Phytotaxonomicum". Scientific Journal of the I.A.P.T. It will appear at irregular intervals. One volume will consist of 4 parts of 100 pages each. This journal is meant for such scientific contributions as are of general importance to Plant Taxonomy

---

Kobuski, C. E. 1950. Alfred Rehder. 1863—1949. (with portrait). Journ. Arnold Arboretum 31: 1—38.
Rollins, R. C., A. S. Pease and H. M. Raup, 1950. Merrit Lyndon Fernald. Harvard Univ. Gazette 46: 77—79.
Sax, K. 1950. Oakes Ames, 1874—1950. (with portrait). Journ. Arnold Arboretum 31: 335—349.

and Plant Geography and will be open to all members of the Association.

"Regnum Vegetabile". A series of handbooks for the use of Plant Taxonomists and Plant Geographers, e.g. Index Herbariorum, Rules of Nomenclature, Genera Plantarum, Distribution Maps, Monographs of Plant Groups etc.

International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature.

This is the administrative centre of the I.A.P.T.; it is under the direction of the SECRETARY. Its most important duties are: Administration of the Association, Organizing of committees and meetings, Editing of publications, Distribution and exchange of materials, General information.

Note: All publications and letters dealing with the general organization of the I.A.P.T. will be signed by the Director. Letters about scientific information etc. may be signed by DR F. A. STAFLEU, scientific secretary of the bureau. Letters about technical matters may be signed by the administrative secretary, MISS W. KEUKEN.

Transfer of membership fees.

The transfer of membership fees will meet with relatively high exchange fees if they are sent out of the country separately. To save money on overseas postage and on bank collection or clearing-house fees we suggest to have the fees collected by one person in each country.

The following persons have offered to handle the collection of fees:

AUSTRIA — Dr K. H. Rechinger, Naturhistorisches Museum, Botanische Abteilung, Burgring 7, Wien.

BELGIUM — Prof. Dr W. Robyns, Rijksplantentuin, Koninklijke Straat 236, Brussel.

CANADA — Prof. J. Rousseau, Montreal Botanical Garden, 4101 Sherbrooke Street, East Montreal, Que.

EGYPT — Dr Mohammed Drar, Fouad I Agricultural Museum, Dokki, Cairo.

ITALY — Prof. Dr R. E. G. Pichi Sermolli, Herbarium Universitatis Florentinae, Istituto Botanico dell' Universitá, Via Lamarmora no. 4, Firenze.

NORWAY — Prof. K. Faegri, Universitetet I Bergen, Botanisk Museum, Bergen.

U.S.A. — Prof. R. C. Rollins, Gray Herbarium, Harvard University, 79 Garden Street, Cambridge 38, Mass.

We invite taxonomists in other countries to volunteer as financial agent for their country. Speedy application to us will be greatly appreciated.

Application for membership.

Application for Membership of the I.A.P.T. should be made on a special form or in a letter to the Secretary: Prof. J. Lanjouw, Lange Nieuwstraat 106, Utrecht, Netherlands. Extra copies of a circular letter are available on request.

Institutes, Members of the I.A.P.T.

The following institutes joined the I.A.P.T.:

Supporting:

BRUXELLES — Jardin Botanique de l'Etat, Bruxelles, Belgium.

OTTAWA — National Museum of Canada, Ottawa, Canada.

Regular:

ANAHEIM — Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden, Anaheim, California.

BERLIN — Botanischer Garten und Museum, Berlin-Dahlem, Germany.

BERN — Institut et Jardin botaniques de l'Université, Bern, Switzerland.

BRUXELLES — Institut National pour l'Étude agronomique du Congo Belge, (INEAC), Bruxelles, Belgium.

GRAZ — Institut für systematische Botanik der Universität, Graz, Austria.

LA HABANA — Sociedad Cubana de Botanica, Jardin Botanico de la Universidad, La Habana, Cuba.

ITHACA — Bailey Hortorium, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.

LAUSANNE — Musée de Botanique, Lausanne, Switzerland.

LEIDEN — Rijksherbarium, Leiden, Netherlands.

LIMA — Museo de Historia Natural "Javier Prado", Lima, Peru, S.A.

LUND — Institute of Systematic Botany, The University, Lund, Sweden.

NEW YORK — New York Botanical Garden, New York, U.S.A.

RABAT — Institut Scientifique Chérifien, Rabat, Maroc.

SINGAPORE — The Department of Botany, University of Malaya, Singapore, Malaya.

SYDNEY — National Herbarium of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.

UTRECHT — Botanisch Museum en Herbarium, Utrecht, Netherlands.

Associate:

GÖTEBORG — Botanic Garden, Göteborg, Sweden.

LIÈGE — Institut Botanique de l'Université de Liège, Belgium.

SAN FRANCISCO — California Academy of Sciences Library, San Francisco 18, California.

The number of Institutes, Societies etc. who have joined the I.A.P.T. is still much too small.

We know that this is usually due to difficulties caused by statutary regulations. For some Institutes it is impossible to join an association. This difficulty can be overcome by *subscribing* to the publications of the association, for the subscribers will have the same rights as the members. For quite a number of the smaller Institutes, especially those in the low currency countries, the amount of 25 dollars or even of 10 dollars means a substantial draw on their budget. The same is true for a large number of personal members. We can assure every one of them that the managing board is diligent in this. However, when we wish to accomplish something, it is clear that we require funds. We are convinced that the membership of our association will become in the future a valuable asset. A strong association can achieve important results e.g. by publishing valuable material. As we are no commercial firm, we can keep the costs of our publications comparatively low.

Therefore, you are once again earnestly requested to join the association. Try it for 1 or 2 years, and see for yourself what it is worth to join.

The Stockholm 1950 Rules of Botanical Nomenclature

by

J. LANJOUW, Rapporteur général

All taxonomists are of course anxious to know what results were reached at Stockholm in the section of Nomenclature. Unfortunately it will take a little more time before the definite edition of the Rules is ready: elsewhere in this number you will find some information with regard to the activities of the Editorial Committee. However, it seems desirable to issue a report on the most important changes. They may be summarized as follows:

1. In the Rules the term *"taxonomic group"* will be changed in *"taxon"* (plural *"taxa"*).

2. In a new article the terms *"legitimate"*, *"illegitimate"*, *"effective"* and *"valid"* are defined. The new text will approximately be: a *"legitimate"* name or epithet is one that is in strict accordance with the Rules. Every name or epithet that is not in strict accordance with the Rules is *illegitimate.*
   Effective publication is publication in in strict accordance with art. 36.
   Valid publication is publication in strict accordance with art. 37—45.
   When in the Rules the term *"name"* (legitimate or illegitimate) is used, it always refers to a name that is effectively and validly published.
   Note: The earliest legitimate name applied to a taxon with particular circumscription, position and rank, is called the *"correct name"*.

3. In stead of art. 18 and Recommendation IV—VII are accepted 5 new articles and 2 recommendations.
   The full text of these articles and recommendations will be found in a subsequent issue under the heading *"The new Rules of typification"*.

4. It is decided that the publication-dates of works serving as "starting point" will be fixed either on Jan. 1 or on December 31st.

5. Apart from conserved names for genera it will be possible to have in future also conserved names for taxa above the rank of genus.

6. In a new recommendation endings are proposed for the names of divisions, classes and subclasses. These names will

preferably be words of Greek origin and in the plural number. Two new articles are added which state that:
a. the rule of priority is not compulsory for names of taxa above the rank of family.
b. Names of orders are taken from one of their principal families, with the ending *-ales*. Suborders are designated in a similar manner, with the ending *-ineae*.

7. The name of a subgenus or section must not be derived from the name of the genus to which it belongs by adding the suffix *-oides* or *-opsis*.

8. The subgenus that includes the type-species of the genus is indicated with the same name as the latter.

9. A species and a taxon below the rank of species are regarded as the sum of the lower taxa, if any. The description of a sub-ordinated taxon which does not include the type of the next higher taxon, automatically creates a second taxon of the same rank for the group which includes the type of the higher taxon. When a taxon of a rank, below that of species includes the type of the species, it will automatically obtain the name of that species unaltered, without citation of an author's name. The use of epithets as *"typicus"*, *"genuinus"* etc. is abandoned.

10. The chapter on names of hybrids and other special categories has been completely revised. The provisional new articles will be published in a forthcoming issue of *"Taxon"*.

11. The *"Horticultural Rules"* too have been recast. The new redaction will be published in a forthcoming issue.

12. Conditions and dates of effective publication are more precisely defined in art. 36 and in a new article. The date of effective publication is the moment when the publication becomes available. Names published on labels of exsiccata will be treated as not validly published.

13. In future "alternative" names will be considered illegitimate.

14. Names of species or of taxa below the rank of species are regarded as not validly published if the generic name which forms part of the binomial has not been validly published before or at the same time.

15. To Recommendation XXI is added that in the description of a new taxon the author should indicate not only the type, but also the place where the latter is preserved.

16. It is recommended that the publication of new taxa be accompanied by a figure.

17. It is recommended to avoid the use of names previously published as *"nomina nuda"*.

18. A name of which the type has been excluded, can only be maintained by "conservation". In this case the author of the name is the botanist who gives the new description.

19. The part of art. 48 concerning the publication of new taxa by one author in the work of another author will be deleted. This part of the article has been replaced by a new recommendation in which it is stated that in such a case the names of the two authors should be connected by the word "in".

20. If the status of a taxon bearing a binary name is changed from that of a species to that of a hybrid or inversally the name of the original author will be maintained but with the addition between brackets of *"pro sp."* or *"pro hybr."*.

21. Misindentifications must not be cited in the synonymy, but at the end of the latter. After the name is added *"Auct. non"* followed by the original author.

22. If the rank of a taxon above that of genus is changed, the root of the name must be preserved; the ending only has to be changed.

23. In art. 62 the sentence dealing with a list of *"nomina ambigua"* is deleted.

24. Art. 63 and Rec. XXXVII dealing with *"nomina dubia"* are deleted.

25. Art. 64 the sentence regarding a list of *"nomina confusa"* is deleted.

26. It is recommended to write the epithets of species and of taxa of lower rank with a small initial.

Nomenclature Committees appointed at Stockholm

1. Advisory Board of Nomenclature.

Prof. B. P. G. Hochreutiner (Switzerland).
Prof. J. Mattfeld (Germany) (†).
Prof. E. D. Merrill (U.S.A.).
Prof. A. A. Pulle (Netherlands).
Dr J. Ramsbottom (Great Britain).
Dr Th. A. Sprague (Great Britain).
Prof. J. Lanjouw *(Rapporteur)* [1]) — Botanisch Museum & Herbarium, Lange Nieuwstraat 106, *Utrecht — Netherlands.*

2. General Committee of Botanical Nomenclature.

Secretary: Prof. J. Lanjouw — Botanisch Museum & Herbarium, Lange Nieuwstraat 106, *Utrecht — Netherlands.*
Dr W. H. Camp (U.S.A.).
Mr J. E. Dandy (Great Britain).
Dr M. A. Donk (Indonesia).
Prof. H. Humbert (France).
Dr H. W. Rickett (U.S.A.).
Prof. W. Robyns (Belgium).
Dr W. Rothmaler (Germany).
Prof. C. G. G. J. van Steenis (Netherlands).

3. Editorial Committee.

General Editor: Prof. J. Lanjouw — Botanisch Museum & Herbarium, Lange Nieuwstraat 106, *Utrecht — Netherlands.*
Prof. Ch. Baehni (Switzerland).
Prof. J. Mattfeld (Germany) (†).
Prof. E. D. Merrill (U.S.A.).
Dr H. W. Rickett (U.S.A.).
Prof. W. Robyns (Belgium).
Dr T. A. Sprague (Great Britain).

The report on the discussions held at Stockholm was completed at the end of December 1950. Owing to difficulties with the printers it has up to now been impossible for the Swedish Committee to publish it. As soon as it is ready, probably all members of I.A.P.T. will receive a copy, free of charge. The delay in the printing of this report has retarded also the work of the *Editorial Committee.* In order to avoid further loss of time the latter decided to proceed with its work without waiting for the official report, and the first part of the new Rules is now being studied by the members of the Committee.

It is to be hoped that at least the English version of the new Rules will be ready early in 1952. The new Rules will be issued by I.A.P.T. and made available to the members at a very low price, so that the work will be accessible to all taxonomists.

4. Committee to deal with urgent nomenclatural needs.

Secretary: Prof. J. Lanjouw — Botanisch Museum & Herbarium, Lange Nieuwstraat 106, *Utrecht — Netherlands.*
Dr W. H. Camp (U.S.A.).
Mr J. E. Dandy (Great Britain).
Prof. H. Gaussen (France).
Mr J. S. L. Gilmour (Great Britain).
Prof. E. D. Merrill (U.S.A.).
Prof. C. Skottsberg (Sweden).
Dr T. A. Sprague (Great Britain).
Miss E. M. Wakefield (Great Britain).

Acting on a suggestion of the congress that this committee should see what could be done in the interest of those who are most concerned in the stabilization of the names of well-known plants now that the congress once more refused the introduction of a list of *"Epitheta specifica conservanda"*, the secretary asked the members to study the problem and to report to him within six months.

The English members decided to form a small subcommittee for the study of this question. Their report can be expected very soon. Very interesting answers were received from three experienced taxonomists, viz. Merrill, Skottsberg and Sprague. Their reaction is printed in full elsewhere in this journal under the heading: *"Conserving names of Species"*.

5. Special Committee on Nomenclature of Cultivated Plants.

Temporary Secretary: Dr W. H. Camp — Academy of Natural Sciences, 19th and the Parkway, *Philadelphia 3, Pa. — U.S.A.*
Dr H. H. Allan (New Zealand).
Dr B. K. Boom (Holland).
Dr J. Mcq. Cowan (Scotland).
Dr H. P. Daepp (Switzerland).
Mr J. E. Dandy (Great Britain).
Mr J. S. L. Gilmour (Great Britain).
Dr N. Hylander (Sweden).
Prof. G. H. M. Lawrence (U.S.A.).
Dr H. W. Rickett (U.S.A.).
Prof. R. C. Rollins (U.S.A.).
Mr W. T. Stearn (Great Britain).
Col. F. C. Stern (Great Britain).

1) The *rapporteur* is ex officio member of all committees.

The main activity of this committee was a consideration of Appendix VII, having to do with the naming of cultivated plants. This Appendix had been formulated by a group of horticulturists, led by Alfred Cogniaux at the Bruxelles International Horticultural Congress (1910) with intentions that it be presented to the International Botanical Congress of 1915, which was not held. At the 9th International Horticultural Congress of London (1930) a set of resolutions on the naming of garden plants was drawn up, incorporating much of the 1910 *Bruxelles Régles*. These resolutions were then presented to the Subsection on Nomenclature of the 5th International Botanical Congress, Cambridge (1930), where they were adopted. These appeared in the 3rd edition of the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature (1935). It was thought, with the continually closer union of botany and horticulture, especially through the medium of modern experimental methods and approaches to common problems, that it might not be amiss for an official committee of the 7th International Botanical Congress, but composed primarily of workers interested in the nomenclature of horticultural materials, to give this Appendix considerable critical attention. The committee has presented the text of Appendix VII in the form of a mimeographed report bearing a preliminary character. It must be considered as provisional and open to suggestions for further modification.

6. Special Committee for Phanerogamae.

Secretary: Prof. R. E. G. Pichi Sermolli — Istituto Botanico dell' Universitá, Via Lamarmora no. 4, *Firenze — Italy.*
Prof. H. J. Lam (Holland).
Dr R. Mansfeld (Germany).
Prof. B. P. G. Hochreutiner (Switzerland).
Dr H. W. Rickett (U.S.A.).
Dr A. C. Smith (U.S.A.).
Prof. C. G. G. J. van Steenis (Holland).
Prof. H. Weimarck (Sweden).
Mr J. E. Dandy (Great Britain).
Mr A. R. Pinto da Silva (Portugal).
Dr J. Leandri (France).
Dr F. R. Fosberg (U.S.A.).

cooptated: A. G. Dugand (Colombia).
W. D. Francis (Australia).
H. Quisumbing (Philippines).

7. Special Committee for Pteridophyta.

Secretary: Mme. Tardieu Blot — 71 Bd Arago — *Paris 13. (France).*
Mr A. H. G. Alston (Great Britain).
Dr Morton (U.S.A.).
Prof. R. E. Holttum (Singapore).
Mr Ballard (Great Britain).
Prof. R. E. G. Pichi Sermolli (Italy).
Dr E. B. Copeland (U.S.A.).

8. Special Committee for Musci.

Secretary: Prof. R. van der Wijk — Goeman Borgesiuslaan 20, *Groningen — Netherlands.*
Dr E. B. Bartram (U.S.A.).
Dr F. Demaret (Belgium).
Dr H. Persson (Sweden).
Prof. P. W. Richards (Great Britain).
Prof. H. Reimers (Germany).
Prof. G. Sayre (U.S.A.).
Prof. W. C. Steere (U.S.A.).

The secretary has prepared a report which is being studied by the members.

9. Special Committee for Hepaticae.

Dr H. Buch (Finland).
Dr A. W. Evans (U.S.A.).
Dr T. C. Frye (U.S.A.).
Dr Hattori (Japan).
Prof. T. Herzog (Germany).
Dr E. L. Little (U.S.A.).
Dr K. Müller (Germany).
Dr F. Verdoorn (U.S.A.).

10. Special Committee for Fungi.

Secretary: Dr D. P. Rogers — New York Botanical Garden, Bronx Park, *New York, 58 — U.S.A.*
Dr G. R. Bisby (Great Britain).
Dr K. B. Boedijn (Indonesia).
Dr R. Ciferri (Italy).
Dr M. A. Donk (Indonesia).
Dr C. W. Emmons (U.S.A.).
Dr J. W. Groves (Canada).
Prof. R. Heim (France).
Mr I. Jörstad (Norway).
Dr M. Le Gal (France).
Dr J. C. Lindquist (Sweden).
Prof. W. J. Lutjeharms (South Africa).
Prof. G. W. Martin (U.S.A.).
Prof. J. A. Nannfeldt (Sweden).
Dr J. Ramsbottom (Great Britain).
Mr J. A. Stevenson (U.S.A.).
Prof. R. Singer (Argentine).
Dr A. Trotter (Italy).

The chief duty of the Committee at this time is to reach a decision concerning proposals for the conservation of generic names. To assist in this a statement has already been sent to the members concerning the changes in the International Rules adopted at Stockholm. A new paper includes three items:

a. a report of the resolutions concerning nomina generica conservanda proposita adopted by the Committee at Stockholm.
b. a list of proposals to be voted on; and
c. a blank ballot, to be marked as completely as the information and convictions of the individual members will permit, and to be returned to the secretary.

11. Special Committee for Lichens.
Secretary: Dr S. Ahlner — Botaniska Avdelningen, Riksmuseum, *Stockholm 50 — Sweden.*
Prof. H. des Abbayes (France).
Dr C. W. Dodge (U.S.A.).
Dr V. J. Grumman (Germany).
Dr J. Mackenzie Lamb (Great Britain).
Dr J. Motyka.
Dr R. A. Maas Geseranus (Holland).
Mr R. Santesson (Sweden).

12. Committee for Bacteria.
Secretary: Prof. O. N. Allen — Dept. Agric. Bact., University of Wisconsin, *Madison 6, Wis. — U.S.A.*
Dr R. S. Breed (U.S.A.).
Dr St John Brooks (U.S.A.).
A report about the work of this committee has been (or is to be) published in the International Bulletin of Bacteriological Nomenclature and Taxonomy.

13. Special Committee for Algae.
Secretary: Dr Tore Levring — Botaniska Trädgarden, *Göteborg — Sweden.*
Dr Bourrelly (France).
Dr F. Drouet (U.S.A.).
Prof. J. Fledman (France).
Prof. Krieger (Germany).
Dr J. Lund (Great Britain).
Prof. G. F. Papenfuss (U.S.A.).
Dr Ruth Patrick (U.S.A.).
Mr R. Ross (Great Britain).
Prof. O. C. Schmidt (Germany).
Prof. H. Skuja (Sweden).
Prof. W. R. Taylor (U.S.A.).
Prof. W. Vischer (Switzerland).
Prof. Yamada (Japan).

14. Special Committee for Diatomaceae.
Secretary: Mr R. Ross — British Museum (Natural History), *London S.W. 7 — Great Britain.*
Mrs A. Cleve-Euler (Sweden).
Dr J. Fruguelli (S. America).
Mr N. I. Hendey (Great Britain).
Dr F. Hustedt (Germany).
Dr R. W. Kolbe (Sweden).
Dr G. Krasske (Germany).
Dr K. Lohman (U.S.A.).
Dr Manguin (France).
Dr Ruth Patrick (U.S.A.).
Dr C. V. Subramanian (Madras).

15. Special Committee for Paleobotany.
Temporary Secretary: Dr Hamshaw Thomas — Botany School, *Cambridge — Great Britain.*
Prof. Ch. A. Arnold (U.S.A.).
Mr W. N. Edwards (Great Britain).
Prof. R. Florin (Sweden).
Prof. W. Gothan (Germany).
Prof. T. G. Halle (Sweden).
Prof. W. J. Jongmans (Holland).
Prof. R. Kraüsel (Germany).
Dr J. Schopf (U.S.A.).
Prof. R. Sitholey (India).

CONSERVING NAMES OF SPECIES

1. *The opinion of Prof. Merrill* (Harvard).

I do not believe, personally, that anything can or should be done about the points raised until the next Congress in 1954, which is not so far off after all. No interim group has the right to make regulations or rules of its own regarding nomenclatural matters. If we had an interim commission, with power, perhaps something could be done. But we have no such a commission. The point at issue is a very simple one. I support, without question, the principle of nomina *generica* conservanda, but for potent reasons I am strongly opposed to any list of nomina *specifica* conservanda. In my opinion such a regulation is unnecessary and uncalled for. The rules, as they are, now certainly are *not mandatory*. Were I a horticulturist and I did not like an older resurrected name, I would continue to use the one with which I was familiar .... it is as simple as that! I, as a botanist, try to follow the rules of nomenclature. But if we let down the bars and set up a list of conserved specific names, the flood wil become overwhelming. Consider for a moment those names which were proposed anterior to the last Congress ...: the total must have been large. There would be no limits, for if *Fulano de Tal* was accustomed

to this or that binomial, and for valid reasons the name were changed, all he has to do is to protest and recommend that the name he is accustomed to be conserved. If some of our best botanists proceed to publish new binomials *under officially rejected generic names* what may we expect from an indefinite and rapidly increasing list of conserved specific names? I say leave the rules as they are and do not let us get our fingers burnt by relenting in favor of a few agressive horticulturists.

The average horticulturist won't pay any attention to the rules anyway, especially if he wants to describe and name a new cultigen. Pat him on the back and tell him to go his way and use whatever name or names he may wish to accept (which would be those with which he is familiar). I insist that *Cedrus libani* would serve any horticulturist or dendrologist as well as if he had used the recently resurrected and older *C. libanotica* (or whatever it is).

Consider for a moment *Cypripedium* versus *Paphiopedilum*. Botanically all the cultivated forms by which orchidologists set such great store belong in *Paphiopedilum*. But no self-respective orchid grower would ever accept the latter name. To him they are all species or varieties of *Cypripedium* and to him they will be "cyps." to the end of time, no matter what the rules of botanical nomenclature prescribe. In all the flower shows I have attended I do not remember a single case where *Cypripedium* was replaced by the botanically correct *Paphiopedilum* for these attractive plants, and yet the botanists and the horticulturists remain on speaking terms!

2. *The Opinion of Prof. Skottsberg.*

I dare say that many taxonomists who rarely if ever work with cultivated species have found that they are burdened with endless name-changes that are obviously harmful. I fail to see why only names of economically important species need protection.

1. Everybody who believes that a list of nomina specifica conservanda would mean an advantage, bases his opinion on experience gained during his own work. The arguments raised against such measures are vague, "a general feeling", a talk of "far-reaching consequences", and so forth. But of what kind? The fear of a long list? Used with critic I cannot see why the list would grow to any frightful length, because it goes without saying that, if in certain cases we reject a name-change otherwise in accordance with the Rules, we must adopt fixed principles for so doing. Just as in the grammar of a language, the Rule remains a rule, even if there are exceptions.

These exceptions would be of two kinds.

a. Protected names of economically important plants such as *Ananas sativus* and *Artocarpus incisa*. In addition, names of geographically important species which for a very long time have been in general use — practically without exception — in floristic and sociological literature, even to designate plant communities; to take one example: *Carex rigida* Good. 1794, should *not* be renamed *bigelowii* Torr. only because there is one *rigida* Schrad. 1789, which was forgotten and ought to rest in peace.

b. As another exception from the rule of the oldest legitimate combination: a change of epithet, which obviously causes confusion, must not be sanctioned; that is, a change which drags along with it one or more further changes, in other words, a chain reaction. Take as example *Carex norvegica*, used for 150 years in a certain sense in hundreds of papers and now applied to a quite different plant. Will a coming generation of botanists, familiar only with the name in its new sense, remember that it used to mean something else and in dealing with distribution etc. avoid mistakes easily made when, as often happens, the author's name has been omitted?
If the Congresses had followed the road indicated by Handel-Mazzetti, who was an eminent and widely experienced taxonomist and a wise man, we would have been on the safe side.

2. I cannot see how we are able to yield to the wishes of agriculturists and horticulturists, nor of other equally respectable workers who object to the digging-up of obsolete names for common, leading species, without conserving a number of younger specific epithets. After all, were or were not the Rules made for the benefit of those who have to use them?

3. *Memorandum by Dr T. A. Sprague.*

The following suggestions are put forward for consideration in the first place by the

other British members of the Committee *), and failing agreement by the British members on a particular set of recommendations, for consideration by the Committee as a whole.

1. There can be no doubt that changes in well-established names of economic plants *(sensu lato)* cause grave inconvenience to non-taxonomists, such as foresters and horticulturists. If proof is needed of this statement, the repeated attempts to establish *'nomina specifica conservanda'* should be sufficient. I feel that some attempt ought to be made to meet the requirements of such workers in applied botany.

2. In my opinion a set of *'nomina specifica conservanda'* is highly undesirable. The following objections may be mentioned:

a. Though the proposers of *'nomina specifica conservanda'* generally state that the list should be strictly limited, say to 100 names, examination of the lists proposed at various Congresses suggests that such *limitation would be impracticable.* As a member of the British Sub-Committee on Nomenclature appointed by the Imperial Botanical Conference, London, 1924, I supported a proposal for *'nomina specifica conservanda'* which was brought forward by that Sub-Committee at the Cambridge Congress, 1930 (British Proposals, p. 10, Art. 22, and p. 34 App. IV). The nature of the lists proposed by various botanists to the Cambridge Congress (Briquet, Rec. Syn. p. 135—138), and the remarks of the Rapporteur (Rec. Syn. p. 138) convinced me, however, that the establishment of a list of *'nomina specifica conservanda'* would raise more difficulties than it removed and I withdrew my support of the proposal (Cambridge Rep. p. 571). Altogether over 100 specific names were proposed for conservation in the three lists submitted to the Cambridge Congress. Among them were two *new combinations,* which would have introduced the principle of *'epitheta specifica conservanda',* and at least one *later homonym.* One of the new combinations violated Art. 58 of the International Rules (Rec. Syn. p. 135, Motion A). *The correct names proposed for rejection in Motions B and C were very widely used by contemporary taxonomists.*

b. If *'nomina specifica conservanda'* were accepted there would be continual additions to the list, so that no botanist applying the Rules of Nomenclature could be certain that the correct names ascertained and used by him would not be rejected in the future.

c. Apart from the intrinsic disadvantages of recognizing *'nomina specifica conservanda'* there is clearly no foreseeable prospect of any International Botanical Congress accepting such a list. The Cambridge Congress rejected Art. B 20 proposing it by a very large majority by show of hands (Rep. p. 575). The Amsterdam Congress rejected Art. 21 bis proposing it by 208 votes to 61 (Proc. Amsterdam Congress, vol. 1, pp. 342, 343). The Stockholm Congress rejected a proposal for *'nomina specifica conservanda'* by 320 votes to 40.

3. A possible alternative method of dealing with the problem is by means of *'nomina specifica rejicienda'* (or *'excludenda', 'proscripta'* or *'praetereunda'*) — see New Article 61 quinquies (Lanjouw, Synopsis, p. 179). This would make it possible to prevent the *relatively few* changes of names of well-known plants which may be entailed *in the future* owing to the discovery of an earlier and overlooked name for the same species. If such a provision had been contained in the Rules at the time it was discovered that *Quercus petraea* was an earlier name for *Q. sessiliflora,* it would have been possible to retain the latter name by placing *Q. petraea* on the list of *'nomina specifica rejicienda'*. In all such cases it would be necessary to decide promptly for or against rejection. The establishment of an International Bureau of Plant Taxonomy will afford the necessary machinery for submitting each case to the appropriate Committee and securing a prompt decision. In course of time horticulturists and foresters will become thoroughly familiar with the changes *already made* under the Rules in the names of well-known plants. The establishment of a list of *'nomina specifica rejicienda'* would make it possible in the future to prevent such inconvenient changes.

It should be emphasized that the placing of a name on the list of *'nomina specifica rejicienda'* is only an act of *conditional rejection.* If, owing to investigation of types, etc., it is found to apply to a different species, its rejection is automatically cancelled.

*) Committee for Urgent Nomenclatural Needs.

4. I think that the case for *'nomina specifica rejicienda'* was prejudiced by its association at Stockholm with *'nomina specifica conservanda'*. The case for it was not adequately put forward *in advance*. Even so, the vote against it was only 242 to 116, or roughly 2 : 1, as compared with that against *'nomina specifica conservanda'*, which was 320 to 40, or 8 : 1. It seems possible that if the case for *'nomina specifica rejicienda'* were adequately presented, it might secure acceptance at the next Congress.

REGULATIONS FOR THE SELECTION OF GENERIC NAMES FOR CONSERVATION

At the Stockholm meeting Dr Sprague was invited to draw up a set of regulations for the selection of generic names for conservation.

Below follow the set of regulations prepared by Dr Sprague. Dr Fosberg, unaware of the fact that Dr Sprague was working on such a set, drew up another set of regulations. Dr Fosberg's account too is published in this issue. All taxonomists are invited to send us their remarks.

I. SUGGESTIONS BY T. A. SPRAGUE

1. Reasons should be stated both *for* and *against* conservation.

2. Both the *number* of species in the genus, and their *general distribution* should be given.
   The occurrence of a genus in more than one continent is important.

3. The adoption of a generic name by authors of the following *Genera Plantarum* etc should be mentioned: Endlicher, Genera Plantarum; DC. Prodomus; Bentham & Hooker, Genera Plantarum; Engler & Prantl, Die Natürlichen Pflanzenfamilien; Dalla Torre & Harms, Genera Siphonogamarum.

4. The adoption of a generic name in the principal *floras* concerned should be mentioned.

5. The adoption of a generic name in *monographs* of the family concerned or *revisions* of the genus should be mentioned, e.g. DC. Monogr. Phan.; Engl. Pflanzenreich.

6. The *economic importance* of the genus, if any, should be stated, with references to the principal works on economic botany in which the name is adopted.

7. *The horticultural importance*, if any, of the genus should be indicated, with references to the horticultural works, such as encyclopaedias, in which the name is adopted.

8. The *morphological ecological or phytogeographical importance* or interest of any species of the genus should be indicated with reference to the principal works dealing with these subjects, in which the generic name is used.

9. The number of *illustrations* under the generic names concerned, if considerable, should be stated.

10. Any *special reasons* for conservation should be pointed out, such as *very undesirable consequences* if the name is *not* conserved. *Bowiea* Harv. ex. Hook. f. (1867) is a later homonym of *Bowiea* Haw. (1824). Non conservation of the former would have resulted in the transference of the name *Bowiea* from one South African genus of Liliaceae to another South African genus of Liliaceae, which would have caused lasting confusion.

11. The cases for *retention* of the proposed nomina generica rejicienda should be given just as fully on the same lines. In fact the aim of a proposer should be to give an *impartial statement* of the reasons for and against conservation, so that the Committee concerned may have all the necessary data for reaching a decision.

12. Examples of cases for conservation may be found in "Proposals by British Botanists, International Botanical Congress, Cambridge (England), 1930"; and in Kew Bull. 1935, pp. 341—544.

II. SUGGESTIONS BY F. R. FOSBERG

In 1905 the botanists at the Vienna International Botanical Congress adopted the principle of the conservation of generic names in order to avoid disadvantageous changes in nomenclature. That this did not turn out to be a universal panacea is well known. After almost fifty years it is not altogether certain that all of the kinks in the original list of Nomina Generica Conservanda are completely eliminated. It seems likely that it would never have been adopted had all the difficulties in its application been forseen. However, it has remained in all subsequent revisions of the Rules, and is obviously here to stay, at least if it is not too seriously abused.

Between the 1935 and 1950 congresses a perfect flood of names have been proposed for conservation, some with elaborate arguments, full documentation, and careful typification, others less well supported, many with no elaboration at all. These are at present being considered by the special committees on the groups concerned. Many will doubtless be recommended for conservation and adopted at the Paris Congress.

It seems appropriate to urge that the committee members responsible scrutinize and study these names with all the care possible, that the new list be reasonably free from the troublesome defects that have marked previous ones. A few suggestions may not be out of order, since these names are now being examined and all committee members may not have thought of these points.

Of first importance, and, indeed, required by the present reading of the rules, is the indication of the type of each name concerned. This is not a simple matter and it is too much to hope that there will be complete agreement on the typification of all the proposed names. The new Guide for the Determination of Types, adopted at Stockholm should enable the committees to come to reasonable unanimity. It cannot be too strongly recommended that if a name cannot be satisfactorily and convincingly typified it should not be conserved.

There is a regrettable tendency to propose familiar names for conservation if they are illegitimate even though there is a name available that is actually in use and fairly familiar to those who have made it a habit to follow the rules as carefully as they know how. It is suggested that if the actually correct name, under the rules, has been brought into use and has become at all familiar, that the rules be allowed to apply and the correct name remain.

There seem to me to be actually very few adequate grounds for conserving names. They may be summarized: 1. If a genus contains important economic species and the name is in *general use* for them. 2. If a genus is one on which extensive morphological, genetical, or physiological work has been published and its name is in general use, especially if it is widely mentioned in textbooks. 3. If it is the type genus of a family and if the name is the basis of the family name or that of a higher category. 4. If the genus is a very large one and the name is universally used in floristic works. 5. If there is an insoluble nomenclatural problem involved and the only satisfactory solution is by conservation of one of the names involved. In the latter type of case the facts in the problems should be published and suggestions invited as to the correct application of the rules.

Possibly there are other valid considerations, but these are the only ones that seem very impressive. Certainly if all of the names that are being considered for conservation be scrutinized in the light of the above grounds, the adoptions should be only a small minority of the proposals.

It may be further pointed out that, as Note 3 to Article 21 now reads there are many pitfalls in its application. The only "other names" which can be absolutely regarded as belonging to the group are synonyms based on the same type species. In other cases it is merely a matter of opinion as to whether including a name in synonymy is not merely uniting or reuniting two groups. Strict interpretation of the second sentence of this note will in many cases defeat the purpose of the proposition for conservation of a name, unless an exhaustive search has been made for all possible competing names for inclusion as Nomina Rejicienda.

COLLECTING TRIPS

Mr J. S. Womersley, Forest Botanist, Lae, New Guinea, has made a reconnaissance and collecting trip to the type locality of Forbes's New Guinea collections in the Sogere region, June-Aug. 1951.

PERSONALIA

Dr H. A. Gleason retired as principal Keeper of the Herbarium, N.Y. Botanical Gardens, Jan. 1st, 1951; he is succeeded by Dr D. D. Keck.

The University of Cambridge has approved in giving Mr R. E. Holttum, Professor of Botany, University of Malaya, Singapore, the degree of Sc. D. June 1951.

On the occasion of the 250th anniversary of Yale University Dr E. D. Merrill received a honorary doctor's degree. Dr Merrill worked in the British Museum, London, for some months starting June 1951'.

Dr R. van der Wijk, Groningen, in charge of the series Bryophyta of the Flora Malesiana, has been awarded the stipendium of the "Buitenzorg-Fonds" for the year 1951; he will depart for Bogor, Java, in December 1951, and will stay for about half a year.

Mr P. van Royen has been appointed assistant to the Rijksherbarium, Leyden; he was awarded the doctor's degree in July 1951, on a thesis: "The Podostemaceae of the New World".

Dr H. N. Moldenke will retire after 23 years of service, from the N.Y. Botanical Gardens, effective Dec. 31st., 1951.

PROBLEMS OF TERMINOLOGY

The term "alternate" in phyllotaxis.

It seems that the term *"alternate"* as used for leaves should be restricted to those leaves which have a phyllotaxis of one half, and that leaves which are inserted in spirals should not be designated as such. For spirally arranged leaves the terms spread or scattered are often used; they are not wrong, but rather indefinite. It has sometimes been overlooked that alternate leaves are typical for groups of genera and even for several families, and it is handy to have, in phytography a fixed term for that phyllotaxis. If alternate is used in the ambiguous sense one ought for precision to add *"biseriate"* if a phyllotaxis of one half is meant. This can be avoided by restriction of the term.

v. Steenis.

REVISIONS COMPLETED

G. F. Freytag: A revision of the genus Guazuma (Ceiba 1, 1951, 193—225).

REVISIONS IN PREPARATION

Mr R. A. Blakelock of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew-Surrey, has a complete synopsis of the genus *Euonymus* (Celastr.) in the press.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL WORKS

E. Quisumbing: Medicinal plants of the Philippines. Rep. of the Philippines, Dep. of Agric. & Nat. Resources, Techn. Bull. no. 10. Manila 1951. 1234 pp. 8°.

NOMENCLATURE

At the end of a discussion session on the results of the Stockholm Congress of 1950, the Systematic Section of the Botanical Society of America, at its annual meeting held in Columbus, Ohio, September 1950, passed a resolution requesting the American Society of Plant Taxonomists to set up a special committee to consider ways and means of further stabilizing botanical nomenclature. Subsequently, at a meeting of the Executive Council of the ASPT, this request was considered. Professor Lincoln Constance, President of the ASPT, moved that such a Committee be set up; the motion was seconded and unanimously passed. The Chairman of the Executive Council of the ASPT, Dr W. H. Camp, was then instructed to set up such a Committee and to report the results of its deliberations to the Council and the Society at a later date.

"Taxon" is directed by: Prof. J. Lanjouw, Chief Editor, and Dr F. A. Stafleu, Assistant-Editor. All correspondence should be sent to the International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, 106 Lange Nieuwstraat, Utrecht — Holland.
All members of I.A.P.T. receive "Taxon" free of charge. Copies of personal members are for private use only and should not be placed in official libraries.
"Taxon" is not on sale. Special regulations for Libraries and Institutes will be supplied on request.